

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 9

August 28, 2018

195 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Greene v. Commissioner of Correction, 330 C 1	3
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that prosecutor's failure to correct allegedly false testimony pertaining to plea agreement for cooperating witness deprived petitioner of right to due process of law; recommendation for conducting examinations of cooperating witnesses with respect to plea agreements, discussed; claim that state violated petitioner's right to due process on ground that prosecutor knew before petitioner's criminal trial, but failed to disclose, intention to recommend favorable sentence for cooperating witness; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying petitioner's request to issue capias.</i>	
Standard Petroleum Co. v. Faugno Acquisition, LLC, 330 C 40	42
<i>Class action; claim that defendant petroleum company, which supplied gasoline products to plaintiff service station operators and franchisees, overcharged them by failing to apply certain federal tax credit and by charging state gross receipts tax; claim under Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (§ 42-110a et seq.); motions for class certification; standards that govern trial court's class certification decision, discussed; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that four prerequisites to class action set forth in applicable rule of practice (§ 9-7) were satisfied; whether trial court abused its discretion in concluding that common issues of law and fact predominated and that class action was superior to other methods of adjudication.</i>	
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	79

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Blossom's Escort, LLC v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act, 184 CA 448 . .	94A
<i>Unemployment compensation benefits; whether trial court improperly dismissed appeal from decision of Employment Security Board of Review affirming decision of appeals referee that affirmed decision of defendant Administrator of Unemployment Compensation Act that plaintiff was liable for certain unpaid unemployment compensation contributions under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court properly determined that amendment (Public Acts 2008, No. 08-150) to statute ([Rev. to 2007] § 31-222 (a) (5) (O)) that sets forth types of services that are exempt from definition of employment under § 31-222 did not apply to present case where audit period preceded effective date of amendment to statute; claim that because administrator informed plaintiff of liability for unemployment compensation benefits following effective date of amendment in P.A. 08-150, date of determination letter triggered application of amendment; whether audit period referenced in determination letter was time period during which plaintiff's obligation to make unemployment compensation contributions arose.</i>	
Glastonbury v. Sakon, 184 CA 385	31A
<i>Foreclosure; action to foreclose municipal tax liens; attorney's fees authorized by statute (§ 12-193); claim that total award of attorney's fees was unreasonable when compared to amount of tax liens at issue and to attorney's fees awarded in similar tax lien foreclosure cases; whether trial court abused discretion in determining amount of attorney's fees awarded.</i>	

(continued on next page)

Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Barros, 184 CA 395	41A
<i>Equitable subrogation; uninsured motorist benefits; claim that equitable subrogation action was subject to same statute of limitations period as underlying tort claims; whether claim sounding in equity is subject to statute of limitations; reviewability of claim that equitable subrogation action was precluded under doctrine of laches.</i>	
Real Estate Mortgage Network, Inc. v. Squillante, 184 CA 356	2A
<i>Foreclosure; subject matter jurisdiction; claim that trial court improperly denied named defendant's second motion to reopen judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court correctly concluded that motion to reopen was moot; whether trial court should have dismissed rather than have denied motion to reopen.</i>	
Sovereign Bank v. Harrison, 184 CA 436	82A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court erred in interpreting defendant's special defense as counterclaim; whether trial court lacked authority to grant motion to restore case to docket; whether third special defense could reasonably be construed as stating independent cause of action.</i>	
State v. Jackson, 184 CA 419.	65A
<i>Sexual assault in first degree; unlawful restraint; collateral estoppel; double jeopardy; claim that trial court improperly admitted into evidence in defendant's second trial portion of witness' statement that jury in defendant's first trial necessarily had rejected when jury found defendant not guilty of unlawful restraint charge; whether admission of evidence violated defendant's fifth amendment guarantee against double jeopardy; whether finding of not guilty on charge of unlawful restraint and finding that witness made credible statement were not mutually exclusive findings or in any way inconsistent; whether jury reasonably could have believed statement but found that statement did not establish or demonstrate that defendant had intent to unlawfully restrain victim; whether defendant demonstrated that jury, in finding defendant not guilty of unlawful restraint in first trial, necessarily rejected witness' statement.</i>	
State v. Si, 184 CA 402	48A
<i>Negligent homicide with commercial motor vehicle; claim that trial court improperly instructed jury because it failed to instruct jurors that it would be complete defense to charge of negligent homicide with commercial motor vehicle that decedent's negligence was sole proximate cause of own death; claim that jury charge was materially misleading because jury instructions on proximate causation could have led jury to disregard conduct of decedent entirely and, thus, to ignore possibility that decedent was sole proximate cause of own death; whether trial court erred when it provided jury with copy of jury charge during deliberations.</i>	
Teodoro v. Bristol, 184 CA 363	9A
<i>Negligence; action for damages for injuries to student incurred during high school cheerleading practice; whether trial court, in deciding motion for summary judgment, improperly failed to consider excerpts from certified deposition transcripts, where excerpts were submitted with pages from original deposition transcripts that established that original transcripts were accurate transcriptions of testimony under oath; whether excerpts from deposition transcripts were properly authenti-</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>cated under rule of practice (§ 17-45) that governs admissible evidence as to issues raised in summary judgment motions; whether trial court abused discretion in not considering surreply memoranda of law in contravention of applicable rule of practice ([2016] § 11-10).</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	103A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of	1B
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Disbarment of Attorney.	1C
---	----
